



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/597,315

07/20/2006

Neal Goldberg

US040081

9242

24737

7590

04/27/2009

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

EKPO, NNENNA NGOZI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2425

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,315	Applicant(s) GOLDBERG, NEAL	
	Examiner Nnenna N. Ekpo	Art Unit 2425	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement

1. This Office Action is responsive to the arguments filed on December 29, 2008.

Specification

2. Previous objection to the abstract/specification is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment filed on December 29, 2008.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,778) in view of Majeti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,412).

Regarding **claim 1**, Peters et al. discloses a method for managing a plurality of programs, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a call processor that receives a program request initiated by a user via a key-pad device (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 1, lines 32-41, col. 2, lines 1-5, fig 1),

establishing a communication channel with the key-pad device to generate a command signal indicative of a program desired by the user (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-30, fig 1); and

transmitting the command signal to a television unit for display of the program desired by the user (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-53, fig 1).

However, Peters et al. is silent on establishing a separate second communication channel with a television unit.

Majeti et al. discloses establishing a separate second communication channel with a television unit (see col. 1, lines 22-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Majeti et al. for the advantage of providing higher data transfer rates especially from service providers to end users in view of multimedia applications.

Regarding **claim 9**, Peters et al. discloses a system for managing a plurality of programs, comprising:

an input device having a key pad for transmitting a program request by a user (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 1, lines 32-41, col. 2, lines 1-5, fig 1),
and

a controller for generating a command signal indicative of a program selected by the user interactively (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-30, fig 1) and transmitting the command signal to a receiver for display (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-53, fig 1), a first communication channel (see col. 2, lines 61-65).

However, Peters et al. is silent on a second communication channel.

Majeti et al. discloses first communication channel and second communication channel (see col. 1, lines 22-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Majeti et al. for the advantage of providing higher data transfer rates especially from service providers to end users in view of multimedia applications.

Regarding **claim 19**, Peters et al. discloses a system for managing a plurality of programs, comprising:

a memory for storing a computer-readable code (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 1-3, 9-21, fig 1) and

a processor operatively coupled to said memory (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 1-3, 9-21, fig 1), said processor configured to:

receive a program request initiated by a user via a key-pad device (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 1, lines 32-41, col. 2, lines 1-5, fig 1);

establish a communication channel with the key-pad device to generate a command signal reflective of a program desired by the user interactively (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-30, fig 1); and

transmit the command signal to a display unit for displaying the program desired by the user (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, col. 3, lines 22-53, fig 1).

However, Peters et al. is silent on a second communication channel.

Majeti et al. discloses a separate second communication channel (see col. 1, lines 22-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Majeti et al. for the advantage of providing higher data transfer rates especially from service providers to end users in view of multimedia applications.

Regarding **claim 3**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). Peters et al. discloses the method wherein the command signal comprises a signal to store a particular program (newscast) in a storage medium (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 9-12, fig 1).

Regarding **claims 4, 17 and 21**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claims 1, 9 and 19*). Peters et al. discloses the method wherein the plurality of programs includes at least one of a television

Art Unit: 2425

network (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 9-21), Internet network, wireless network (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 4, lines 18-28), and wired network, or a combination thereof.

Regarding **claim 5**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). Peters et al. discloses the method wherein the communication channel is established by a phone-line connection (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 4-8, 22-30).

Regarding **claim 6**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). Peters et al. discloses the method wherein the communication channel is established by wireless connection (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 4, lines 18-38).

Regarding **claim 7**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 1*). Peters et al. discloses the method wherein the display of the program is provided interactively in response to said user's input (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 18-26).

Regarding **claim 10**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system wherein the

Art Unit: 2425

controller further provides a program list selectable by the user (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 34-40).

Regarding **claim 11**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system further comprising a display device for displaying the program selected by the user (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 34-40).

Regarding **claim 12**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system wherein the display device is configured to receive incoming television programs (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 34-40).

Regarding **claim 14**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system wherein the input device comprises a plurality key buttons to selectively transmit the command signal (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 4, lines 65-col.5, line 17).

Regarding **claim 15**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (see *claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system wherein the receiver is a television unit (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 2, lines 55-60, col. 4, lines 6-11, fig 1).

Regarding **claim 16**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 9*). Peters et al. discloses the system further comprising a storage device for storing data representative of a plurality of programs corresponding to incoming television programs (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines 9-21).

6. **Claims 2, 8, 13, 18 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,778) and Majeti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,412) as applied to *claims 1, 9 and 19* above, and further in view of Coddington et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,410,343).

Regarding **claims 2, 13 and 20**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1, 9 and 19*). However, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. fail to specifically disclose the method further comprising the step of authenticating the user upon the establishment of the communication channel.

Coddington et al. discloses the method further comprising the step of authenticating the user upon the establishment of the communication channel (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 9, lines 19-37, fig 7A-D).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al. and Majeti et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Coddington et al. for the advantage of verifying the user.

Regarding **claim 8**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). However, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. fail to specifically disclose the method wherein the display of the program is provided interactively in response to said user's voice input.

Coddington et al. discloses the method wherein the display of the program is provided interactively in response to said user's voice input (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 6, lines 11-22, 34-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al. and Majeti et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Coddington et al. for the advantage of speaking a user's selection.

Regarding **claim 18**, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 9*). However, Peters et al. and Majeti et al. fail to specifically disclose the system wherein the input device further comprising a voice response device for interactively transmitting a program request by a user.

Coddington et al. discloses the system wherein the input device further comprising a voice response device for interactively transmitting a program request by a user (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 6, lines 11-22, 34-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters et al. and Majeti et al.'s invention with

the above mentioned limitation as taught by Coddington et al. for the advantage of speaking a user's selection.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dunn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,613) discloses a simplified TV viewer response system coupled to a telephone system that enables a viewer/subscriber to respond to television displays by dialing special digits on the keypad.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2425

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nnenna N. Ekpo whose telephone number is 571-270-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nnenna N. Ekpo/
Patent Examiner
April 17, 2009.

/Brian T. Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425